



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,709	08/25/2006	Eugene Pascal Herczog	TTP104247	4391
20/280	7590	11/17/2008	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC			NGUYEN, DUC M	
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45				
W4 - 39Q			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			2618	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/17/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM  
ADB035@Motorola.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,709	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HERCZOG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> DUC M. NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/06, 11/3/08.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The references listed in the information disclosure statements submitted on 8/25/06 and 11/3/08 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

***Priority***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC, 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Ormson (US 7,433,709)** in view of **Hsieh et al (US 7,260,068)**.

Regarding claim 6, **Ormson** teaches a GSM/UMTS wireless communications network participant comprising:

a plurality of communications subsystems, each subsystem being arranged to transmit and/or receive signals under a different telecommunications standard (see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 35-67);

a generator for generating a clock signal (see Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-20); and a scheduler for sending commands to at least one of the subsystems for its or their operation, the scheduler deducing the timing of the commands relative to the clock signal (see Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 8-48 regarding counters 24, 32 and logic blocks 18, 26).

However, **Ormson** fails to teach a scheduler for deducing the timing of the commands relative to the clock signal. However, **Hsieh** teaches a scheduler for deducing the timing of the commands relative to the clock signal by setting a count value for a counter (see Fig. 3 regarding refs. 84, 74, 75, 72 and col. 11, lines 42-48). Since Ormson and Hsieh both teach a sleep mode signal and counters, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Ormson** for providing a scheduler as suggested by **Hsieh**, to command the independent logics in the **Ormson** to set a count value for each counter in independent logics so that a GSM clock timebase signal and a UMTS clock timebase signal would be achieved for synchronizing with the timing of a respective GSM base station or a respective UMTS base station, for synchronizing and/or power management purpose.

Regarding claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above. In addition, it is clear that **Ormson** as modified in view of **Hsieh** would teach several subsystems each receive commands from the scheduler on the basis of the clock signal (see Hsieh, Fig. 3 regarding refs. 84, 74, 75, 72 and col. 11, lines 42-48).

Regarding claim **8**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above. In addition, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Ormson** for providing the clock signal that would match to at least one of the subsystems and the or each matched subsystem is arranged to utilize the clock signal without the intermediary of the scheduler in the similar way as disclosed by **Hsieh** (see Fig. 1 regarding timing generator 46 of the GSM system receiving a clock signal without the need of a counter or the intermediary of the scheduler), for cost saving (i.e, by eliminating a counter).

Regarding claim **9**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above. In addition, **Ormson** teaches one of said subsystems is a GSM subsystem and another is a UMTS subsystem (see col. 3, lines 39-67).

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See the attached PTO-892.

6. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300 (for **formal** communications intended for entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or **draft** communications).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window,  
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner  
should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893,  
Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Nay Maung (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-7882.

/Duc M. Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Oct 28, 2008